UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/814,065	03/30/2004	Gregory G. Rose	PA392C1C2C2	5480
	7590 03/05/200 INCORPORATED	9	EXAMINER	
5775 MOREHO	OUSE DR.		CALLAHAN, PAUL E	
SAN DIEGO, CA 92121			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2437	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/05/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

us-docketing@qualcomm.com kascanla@qualcomm.com nanm@qualcomm.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/814,065	ROSE, GREGORY G.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	PAUL CALLAHAN	2437
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet wit	th the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perion. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stat Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the may earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re- od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON cute, cause the application to become AB.	CATION. Poply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ TH Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice unde	nis action is non-final. vance except for formal matte	-
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-12,14 and 15 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withd 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1 and 15 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) 2-12 is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	rawn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Exami 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	ccepted or b) objected to be drawing(s) be held in abeyan ection is required if the drawing(ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a li	ents have been received. ents have been received in Apriority documents have been eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	oplication No received in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s	ummary (PTO-413))/Mail Date formal Patent Application ·

Application/Control Number: 10/814,065 Page 2

Art Unit: 2437

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

- 1. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.
- 2. Claims 1-12 and 15 are pending and have been examined.

Terminal Disclaimer

3. The terminal disclaimer does not comply with 37 CFR 1.321(b) and/or (c) because: An attorney or agent, not of record, is not authorized to sign a terminal disclaimer in the capacity as an attorney or agent acting in a representative capacity as provided by 37 CFR 1.34 (a). See 37 CFR 1.321(b) and/or (c).

Double Patenting

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In *re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to

be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

- 5. Claim 1 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,075,859. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claim 1 of US Patent 6,075,859 contains every element of claims 1 of the instant application and as such anticipates claim 1 of the instant application.
- 6. Claim 15 rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,075,859 in view of claim 1 of US Patent 6,768,797.

Claim 1 of 6,075,859 teaches the limitations recited by claim 15 of the instant application of: first encoding one of said set of message signals in accordance with a first keyed transformation, second encoding one of said set of message signals in accordance with a self-inverting transformation in which at least one of said message signals is altered (reads on the third encoding step of 6,075,859), third encoding one of said set of message signals in accordance with a second keyed transformation, wherein said second keyed transformation is the inverse of said first keyed transformation (reads on the second encoding step of 6,075,859), wherein the first and the third encoding is performed in accordance with a table, and wherein the first and third encoding are

performed in alternating directions (reads on the use of an inverse keyed transformation recited by claim 1 of US 6,075,859). US Patent 6,075,859 does not teach the generation of a table that is formed by strict permutation. However US Patent 6,768,797 does teach this feature in its claim 1. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated this table feature of claim 1 of US Patent 6,768,797, into the method of transforming data recited by claim 1 of US Patent 6,075,859. It would have been desirable to do so since the CMEA protocol uses a table in its substitution box encryption and use of such a table formed by strict permutation would increase the security of the system by increasing the difficulty in the cryptanalysis of it.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 2-12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul E. Callahan whose telephone number is (571) 272-3869. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 9 to 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise, can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone

Application/Control Number: 10/814,065 Page 5

Art Unit: 2437

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is: (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Paul Callahan/ Examiner, Art Unit 2437

/Nasser G Moazzami/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2436